<center>**Remarks**</center>

The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of
Claims 1-5.

Claims 13-24 have been rejected under 35 USC 112 as failing to
comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner is respectfully
requested to reconsider this rejection.

Claim 13 is directed to a multicast-to-unicast converter embedded in
an intermediate device of a network. This embodiment of the invention is
described on page 10, lines 11-24 of the instant specification. The operation
of this embodiment is shown in Figure 4A of the instant Drawing. Note that
page 11, lines 13-20, indicate that the invention may be implemented in
hardware, software, firmware, or any combination thereof. The Applicants
therefore submit that Claim 13 complies with 35 USC 112.

Claims 14-17 are dependent from Claim 13 and add further
advantageous features. The Applicants therefore submit that these
subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 13.

Claim 18 is directed to a multicast-to-unicast converter which is
external to an intermediate device in a network, using a dedicated terminal.
This embodiment of the invention is described in the instant Specification
from page 10, line 25, to page 11, line 12. Its operation is shown in Figure 4B
of the instant Drawing. As with the subject matter of Claim 13, page 11,
lines 13-20, indicate that the invention may be implemented in hardware,
software, firmware, or any combination thereof. The Applicants therefore
submit that Claim 18 complies with 35 USC 112.

<center>2</center>

Claims 19-24 are dependent from Claim 18 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants therefore submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 18.

The Examiner has applied US 7,269,182 to Carrel et al to Claims 6-12 and 18-28

Carrel et al shows, in figure 1, multi-cast traffic 127 fed from server 113 through access concentrator 111, which encapsulates multicast traffic into unicast streams 121, 123 and 125. When host 101 transmits a PPPoE active discovery request to concentrator 111, a unicast session is established with host 101. Host 101 receives notification of an IP multicast channel. Host 101 then listens for traffic on the IP multicast channel. If the IP process on host 101 determines that host 101 is listening, the IP process decapsulates the multicast data. If host 101 is not listening, the multicast packet is discarded.

The Examiner has noted that Carrel et al does not teach monitoring transmissions of multicast data packets between said intermediate device and said dedicated terminal by said user device. The Examiner looks to US 2003/0026240 to Eyuboglu et al to supply this lack of teaching.

Eyuboglu et al discloses that access terminals go into a sleep mode after a period of inactivity. In a sleep mode, an access terminal wakes up every 5.12 seconds to monitor for unicast data in a specific Control Channel Cycle. If there is unicast data, the access terminal wakes up and initiates a communication with a Packet Data Sensing Node. See ¶'s 0027 and 0028. When an access terminal initiates a multicast transmission, the access terminal transitions to its monitor state, where it remains for the duration of the multicast session. See ¶0033.

Nowhere does Eyuboglu et al show or suggest:

"monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets between said intermediate device and said dedicated terminal by user devices",

as specifically recited in Claim 6. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 6 is not affected by either Carrel et al or Eyuboglu et al.

Similarly, nowhere does either Carrel et al or Eyuboglu et al show or suggest:

"means for monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets between said intermediate device and said dedicated terminal by user devices",

as specifically set forth in Claim 18. It is therefore clear that neither Carrel et al nor Eyuboglu et al affect the patentability of Claim 18.

Similarly, nowhere does Carrel et al show or suggest:

"establishing a unicast session with a dedicated terminal;
one of said user devices monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets",

as specifically set forth in Claim 27 as amended. Rather, in Carrel et al, only the requesting terminal monitors transmissions, as discussed above. It is therefore clear that Carrel et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 27.

Claim 25 has been rejected under 35USC103(a) as unpatentable over Carrel et al in view of US 2002/0143591 Kahn et al and US 2002/0141394 to Hardisty. Carrel et al has been discussed above. Kahn et al relates to a system for sending multicast information to unicast clients, using agents. Nowhere does Kahn et al show or suggest:

"monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets to determine whether said identified multicast data packets are being transmitted in an already established unicast session",

as specifically set forth in Claim 25.

Hardisty relates to a system for managing Internet protocol of unicast and multicast communications. Nowhere does Hardisty show or suggest:

"monitoring transmissions of said multicast data packets to determine whether said identified multicast data packets are being transmitted in an already established unicast session",

as specifically set forth in Claim 25. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 25 is not affected by Carrel et al, Kahn et al and Hardisty, taken either singly or in combination.

US 2003/0053434 to Chow et al has been cited only against dependent Claims 9 and 21. Chow et al relates to push-to-talk service in a WLAN. Nowhere does Chow et al show or suggest any monitoring to determine if multicast packets are being transmitted in an already established unicast session. It is therefore clear that Chow et al is no more pertinent to the independent Claims than the other references which have been applied by the Examiner.

Claims 7-12 are dependent from Claim 6 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 6.

Claims 14-17 are dependent from Claim 13 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 13.

Claims 19-24 are dependent from Claim 18 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 18.

Claim 26 is dependent from Claim 25 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that this subclaim is patentable as its parent Claim 25.

Claim 28 is dependent from Claim 27 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that this subclaim is patentable as its parent Claim 27.

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 1-5. The Applicants submit that Claims 6-28 are also allowable.

        The Applicants submit that the instant application is in condition for
allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

                                        Respectfully submitted,
                                        Guillaume Bichot et al

                                        by__/Catherine A. Cooper/____
                                        Catherine A. Cooper, Attorney
                                        Reg. No. 40,877
                                        609-734-6440
Thomson Licensing LLC
Patent Operations
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
Date: ___20 January 2011___